



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,501	11/02/2001	Barry R. Mumm	R48.12-0019	8350
27367	7590	08/25/2005	EXAMINER	
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A. SUITE 1600 - INTERNATIONAL CENTRE 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319			THANGAVELU, KANDASAMY	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2123		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/005,501	MUMM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kandasamy Thangavelu	2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the Applicant's Response mailed on June 8, 2005. Claim 1 was amended. Claim 2 was deleted. Claims 12 and 13 were added. Claims 1 and 3-13 of the application are pending. This office action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1, 3-7 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ikeda et al.** (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0109949) in view of **Quintero et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,293,479).

4.1 **Ikeda et al.** teaches Commodity design creating and processing system. Specifically as per claim 1, **Ikeda et al.** teaches a method of providing designer product planning information to a customer of a designer product manufacturer in order to customize designer products comprised of combinations of components and/or modules (Abstract, L3-12); the customer operating a client computer in communication with a computer network (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120); the method comprising:

transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2; three-dimensional part graphics stored in the server; user can select a part graphic whose specification match the user's likes from among plurality of part graphics having different specifications);

receiving over the computer network from the client computer the designer product configuration preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2);

retrieving drawing data, from a database of designer product drawings, for a drawing of a designer product corresponding to the configuration preferences input by the customer (Abstract,

L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; basic watch data items produced by the respective part design programs are stored in the server; user can select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor); and

transmitting computer executable instructions corresponding to the retrieved drawing data over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor), which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to display the drawing of the designer product corresponding to the configuration preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; Page 7, Para 0172; user can select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor).

Ikeda et al. teaches that the design-for-product creating system is applicable to furniture manufacture as long as the consumer can select the parts and uniquely design a part or a product in a desired manner (Page 2, Para 001; Abstract, L3-12). **Ikeda et al.** does not expressly teach a method of providing designer product planning information to a customer of an office furniture system workstation manufacturer in order to customize office furniture system workstation comprised of combinations of components and/or modules; and transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to

input designer product configuration preferences of the office furniture system workstation.

Quintero et al. teaches a method of providing designer product planning information to a customer of an office furniture system workstation manufacturer in order to customize office furniture system workstation comprised of combinations of components and/or modules; and transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences of the office furniture system workstation (CL1, 14-16; CL1, L20-22; CL1, L28-31; CL4, L3-7), because that allows assembling diverse components into final products to meet different needs of each customer and application (CL1, L20-22) and as per **Ikeda et al.** the components all fit properly to meet the customer preferences (Abstract, L9-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the method of **Ikeda et al.** with the method of **Quintero et al.** that included a method of providing designer product planning information to a customer of an office furniture system workstation manufacturer in order to customize office furniture system workstation comprised of combinations of components and/or modules; and transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences of the office furniture system workstation. The artisan would have been motivated because that would allow assembling diverse components into final products to meet different needs of each customer and application) and the components would all fit properly to meet the customer preferences.

4.2 As per Claims 3, 4, 5 and 6, **Ikeda et al.** and **Quintero et al.** teach the method of claim 1.

Ikeda et al. teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2; three-dimensional part graphics stored in the server; user can select a part graphic whose specification match the user's likes from among plurality of part graphics having different specifications);

transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred furniture configuration (Page 1, Para 0008);

which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred furniture size (Page 4, Para 0121);

which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred furniture quantity (Page 16, Para 0295);

which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred furniture orientation (Page 1, Para 0008).

Ikeda et al. does not expressly teach transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation

configuration; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation size; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation quantity; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation orientation. **Quintero et al.** teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation configuration; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation size; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation quantity; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation orientation (CL1, 14-16; CL1, L20-22; CL1, L28-31; CL4, L3-7), because that allows assembling diverse components into final products to meet different needs of each customer and application (CL1, L20-22) and as per **Ikeda et al.** the components all fit properly to meet the customer preferences (Abstract, L9-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the method of **Ikeda et al.** with the method of **Quintero et al.** that included transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation configuration; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client

computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation size; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation quantity; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation orientation. The artisan would have been motivated because that would allow assembling diverse components into final products to meet different needs of each customer and application) and the components would all fit properly to meet the customer preferences.

4.3 As per claim 7, **Ikeda et al.** and **Quintero et al.** teach the method of claim 6. **Ikeda et al.** teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2; three-dimensional part graphics stored in the server; user can select a part graphic whose specification match the user's likes from among plurality of part graphics having different specifications); and

transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120).

Ikeda et al. does not expressly teach computer executable instructions when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input at least one of fabric grade preferences, under-worktop storage component and/or module

preferences, overhead storage component and/or module preferences, computer support component and/or module preferences, and series type preferences. **Quintero et al.** teaches computer executable instructions when executed on the computer cause the program on the computer to prompt the customer to input at least one of fabric grade preferences, under-worktop storage component and/or module preferences, overhead storage component and/or module preferences, computer support component and/or module preferences, and series type preferences (CL3, L49-55; CL4, L3-20), because the furniture system comprises several basic components (CL4, L 6-8) and as per **Ikeda et al.** the components should all fit properly to meet the customer preferences (Abstract, L9-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the method of **Ikeda et al.** with the method of **Quintero et al.** that included computer executable instructions when executed on the computer cause the program on the computer to prompt the customer to input at least one of fabric grade preferences, under-worktop storage component and/or module preferences, overhead storage component and/or module preferences, computer support component and/or module preferences, and series type preferences. The artisan would have been motivated because the furniture system would comprise several basic components and the components should all fit properly to meet the customer preferences.

4.4 As per claim 11, **Ikeda et al.** and **Quintero et al.** teach the method of claim 1. **Ikeda et al.** teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to query the user to provide an

input indicative of a desire to order the designer product corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer; and receiving over the computer network from the client computer an order for the designer product corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L16-19).

4.5 As per claims 12 and 13, **Ikeda et al.** and **Quintero et al.** teach the method of claim 1. **Ikeda et al.** teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing the steps of method claim 1; and computer system configured to implement the steps of method claim 1 (Abstract, L3-12; Fig. 1; Page 4, Para 0120).

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ikeda et al.** (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0109949) in view of **Quintero et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,293,479), and further in view of **Han et al.** (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0052807).

5.1 As per claim 8, **Ikeda et al.** and **Quintero et al.** teach the method of claim 1. **Ikeda et al.** teaches transmitting computer executable instructions corresponding to the retrieved drawing data over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131), which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to display the drawing of the designer product corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0008; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; Page 7, Para 0172), further comprises:

transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to display a plurality of different downloadable file types, each corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0008; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; Page 7, Para 0172; user can select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor).

Ikeda et al. teaches displaying a three dimensional drawing file (Page 1, Para 0008) and a CAD drawing (Page 4, Para 0122; Page 5, Para 0136).

Ikeda et al. does not expressly teach that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a two dimensional drawing file and a Bill of Materials file. **Han et al.** teaches that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a two dimensional drawing file (Page 5, Para 0063) and a Bill of Materials file (Page 2, Para 0020; Page 5, Para 0063), because the online service supports product data including bill of materials and two and three dimensional drawings (Page 5, Para 0063); and that allows using internet to essentially build-to-order by allowing the customers to participate on-line in picking and choosing the components and accessories for customizing a basic product marketed by the company (Page 1, Para 0010). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the method of **Ikeda et al.** with the method of **Han et al.** that included the plurality of different file types including one or more of a two dimensional drawing file and a Bill of Materials file. The artisan would have been motivated because the online service supports

product data including bill of materials and two and three dimensional drawings; and that would allow using internet to essentially build-to-order by allowing the customers to participate on-line in picking and choosing the components and accessories for customizing a basic product marketed by the company.

5.2 As per claim 9, **Ikeda et al.** and **Quintero et al.** teach the method of claim 8. **Ikeda et al.** teaches that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a three dimensional drawing file (Page 1, Para 0008) and a CAD drawing (Page 4, Para 0122; Page 5, Para 0136).

Ikeda et al. does not expressly teach that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a two dimensional drawing file and a Bill of Materials file. **Han et al.** teaches that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a two dimensional drawing file (Page 5, Para 0063) and a Bill of Materials file (Page 2, Para 0020; Page 5, Para 0063), because the online service supports product data including bill of materials and two and three dimensional drawings (Page 5, Para 0063); and that allows using internet to essentially build-to-order by allowing the customers to participate on-line in picking and choosing the components and accessories for customizing a basic product marketed by the company (Page 1, Para 0010). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the method of **Ikeda et al.** with the method of **Han et al.** that included the plurality of different file types including one or more of a two dimensional drawing file and a Bill of Materials file. The artisan would have been motivated because the online service supports product data including bill of materials and two and three dimensional drawings; and that would

allow using internet to essentially build-to-order by allowing the customers to participate on-line in picking and choosing the components and accessories for customizing a basic product marketed by the company.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ikeda et al.** (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0109949) in view of **Quintero et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,293,479), and further in view of **Ouchi** (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0078975).

6.1 As per claim 10, **Ikeda et al.** and **Quintero et al.** teach the method of claim 8. **Ikeda et al.** does not expressly teach receiving over the computer network from the client computer a request to download one of the plurality of different file types corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer; and transmitting over the computer network to the client computer the requested one of the plurality of different file types corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer. **Ouchi** teaches receiving over the computer network from the client computer a request to download one of the plurality of different file types corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer; and transmitting over the computer network to the client computer the requested one of the plurality of different file types corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer (Page 1, Para 0003, Para 0004 and Para 0010), because for design and manufacture of the product the information is in the form of computer files (Page 1, Para 0006); and the process steps are executed by the users or programs that use the files (Page 1, Para 0004); and as per **Ikeda et al.** that allows basic data items produced by the respective part design programs to be stored in the

Art Unit: 2123

server; user can select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; it enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the method of **Ikeda et al.** with the method of **Ouchi** that included receiving over the computer network from the client computer a request to download one of the plurality of different file types corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer; and transmitting over the computer network to the client computer the requested one of the plurality of different file types corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer. The artisan would have been motivated because for design and manufacture of the product the information would be in the form of computer files; and the process steps would be executed by the users or programs that used the files; and that would allow basic data items produced by the respective part design programs to be stored in the server; user could select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; it would enable the user to view virtual products that would be graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on June 8, 2005 have been fully considered. The arguments with respect to 102 (e) and 103 (a) rejections are moot, in view of new rejections made against the amended claims..

8.1 As per the applicants' argument that "Ikeda is fundamentally different than the method recited in claim 1; first, Ikeda teaches a design program allowing the user to uniquely design and view products; it is directed to the use of three-dimensional part data to allow users to "customize" products to their own likeness; the functionality of the design program is the basis of Ikeda as the design program is self-contained and allows the user access to all applicable design functionality; Ikeda simply does not teach or suggest causing a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences as recited in claim 1; the use of a web browser to input design preferences, to transmit said preferences over a computer network, and to subsequently receive (over the computes- network) and display the corresponding product design reduces the need to have such a large design program which must include data for all possible designs; it further dispenses with the need to download such a large design program to the client computer", the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Ikeda et al. teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2; three-dimensional part graphics stored in the server; user can select a part graphic whose specification match the user's likes from among plurality of part graphics having different specifications).

Art Unit: 2123

8.2 As per the applicants' argument that "Ikeda does not teach or suggest retrieving a drawing of a designer product corresponding to the configuration preferences input by the customer received over the computer network from the client computer; Ikeda simply describes the design process and subsequent submittal to the manufacturer using the design program; as best can be gleaned from Ikeda, all design data is self contained in the design program as there is simply no mention of transmitting over the computer network to the client computer, computer executable instructions corresponding to the retrieved drawing data to display the drawing of the designer product corresponding to the configuration preferences input by the customer; Ikeda simply does not mention communication regarding the product design to and from the client computer over the computer network; in sum, Ikeda does not teach or suggest the transmitting, receiving, and retrieving steps recited in claim 1", the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Ikeda et al. teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2; three-dimensional part graphics stored in the server; user can select a part graphic whose specification match the user's likes from among plurality of part graphics having different specifications);

receiving over the computer network from the client computer the designer product configuration preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2);

retrieving drawing data, from a database of designer product drawings, for a drawing of a designer product corresponding to the configuration preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; basic watch data items produced by the respective part design programs are stored in the server; user can select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor); and

transmitting computer executable instructions corresponding to the retrieved drawing data over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor), which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to display the drawing of the designer product corresponding to the configuration preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; Page 7, Para 0172; user can select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor).

8.3 As per the applicants' argument that "while Ikeda does suggest utilizing the design program to allow customer to uniquely design furniture, the design of furniture is fundamentally different than the design of office furniture system workstations. Such design of office furniture system workstations includes configuration information beyond simple size and shape characteristics of a chair or a desk for example; the present invention allows a user to design a complex system workstation without the need of drawing data corresponding to all possible

configurations to be downloaded to the user computer as is required in Ikeda”, the examiner has used the reference **Quintero et al.**

Quintero et al. teaches a method of providing designer product planning information to a customer of an office furniture system workstation manufacturer in order to customize office furniture system workstation comprised of combinations of components and/or modules; and transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences of the office furniture system workstation (CL1, 14-16; CL1, L20-22; CL1, L28-31; CL4, L3-7), because that allows assembling diverse components into final products to meet different needs of each customer and application (CL1, L20-22) and as per **Ikeda et al.** the components all fit properly to meet the customer preferences (Abstract, L9-10).

8.4 As per the applicants’ argument that “claims 3-6 recite transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on a client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation configuration, a preferred workstation size, a preferred workstation quantity, or a preferred workstation orientation, respectively; Ikeda utilizes a product design program and makes no mention of causing the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input the above mentioned product configuration preferences; Ikeda simply discloses

that the user utilizes the program to design the product and that product design is submitted to the vendor over the internet”, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Ikeda et al. teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input designer product configuration preferences (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2; three-dimensional part graphics stored in the server; user can select a part graphic whose specification match the user’s likes from among plurality of part graphics having different specifications).

In addition, **Quintero et al.** teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer, which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation configuration; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation size; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation quantity; which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to prompt the customer to input a preferred workstation orientation (CL1, 14-16; CL1, L20-22; CL1, L28-31; CL4, L3-7), because that allows assembling diverse components into final products to meet different needs of each customer and application (CL1, L20-22) and as per **Ikeda et al.** the components all fit properly to meet the customer preferences (Abstract, L9-10).

8.5 As per the applicants' argument that "dependent claim 8 recites causing the web browser on the client computer to display a plurality of different downloadable file types, each corresponding to designer product preferences input by the customer; Ikeda simply does not teach or suggest display of such a plurality of different downloaded file types either in the portions cited in the Office Action", the examiner has used **Ikeda et al.** and **Han et al.**

Ikeda et al. teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause the web browser on the client computer to display a plurality of different downloadable file types, each corresponding to the designer product preferences input by the customer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0008; Page 5, Para 0129 and Para 0131; Page 7, Para 0172; user can select a part graphic which matches a user's likes; enables the user to view virtual products that are graphics expressing the designs created by the product vendor). **Ikeda et al.** teaches displaying a three dimensional drawing file (Page 1, Para 0008) and a CAD drawing (Page 4, Para 0122; Page 5, Para 0136).

Han et al. teaches that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a two dimensional drawing file (Page 5, Para 0063) and a Bill of Materials file (Page 2, Para 0020; Page 5, Para 0063), because the online service supports product data including bill of materials and two and three dimensional drawings (Page 5, Para 0063); and that allows using internet to essentially build-to-order by allowing the customers to participate on-line in picking and

choosing the components and accessories for customizing a basic product marketed by the company (Page 1, Para 0010).

8.6 As per the applicants' argument that "there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Ikeda and Quintero as they relate to inventions that are fundamentally different; Quintero pertains to a knowledge base which includes a plurality of records pertaining to types of connectable components, where there are records containing characteristics for connective components and rules as needed to define combining the component with other connectable components; in this manner, there is simply no suggestion or motivation to combine Quintero with a system involving a downloadable program which allows a user to customize product components as recited in Ikeda; in fact, such a combination would destroy the functionality taught in Quintero; as product components are user modified using the design program, the resultant unique product components would require unique rules outside the scope of Quintero; a set of rules regarding the connection of product components is simply inapplicable in the context of a design program enabling the unique design of said components; as such, even if the rules and records in Quintero regarding connectivity of components were combined with the design program recited in Ikeda, the resultant combination would not achieve the method recited in claim 7", the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Ikeda et al. teaches transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120), which when executed on the client computer cause a web browser on the client computer to prompt the

customer to input designer product configuration preferences (Abstract, L3-12; Page 5, Para 0129; Page 5, Para 0131, CL2; three-dimensional part graphics stored in the server; user can select a part graphic whose specification match the user's likes from among plurality of part graphics having different specifications); and transmitting computer executable instructions over the computer network to the client computer (Abstract, L3-12; Page 1, Para 0001; Page 4, Para 0120).

Quintero et al. teaches computer executable instructions when executed on the computer cause the program on the computer to prompt the customer to input at least one of fabric grade preferences, under-worktop storage component and/or module preferences, overhead storage component and/or module preferences, computer support component and/or module preferences, and series type preferences (CL3, L49-55; CL4, L3-20), because the furniture system comprises several basic components (CL4, L 6-8) and as per **Ikeda et al.** the components should all fit properly to meet the customer preferences (Abstract, L9-10).

Applicants' attention is directed to the fact that one wanting to custom design the furniture modules will use the internet based method of **Ikeda et al.** and select the furniture components and associated drawings from the system of **Quintero et al.** Such a method will not in anyway adversely affect the operation of the **Quintero et al.** system.

8.7 As per the applicants' argument that "the different file types disclosed in Han pertain to online product catalog services which support the creation and maintenance of on-line catalogs of product data; in this manner, there is simply no motivation to combine creation of on-line product catalogs as disclosed in Han with a design program which allows users to create unique

product configurations as recited in Ikeda; the combination of Ikeda and Han does not teach or suggest the method recited in claim 8; such a combination would only provide a downloadable product catalog and would not allow for the user to download data pertaining to the users uniquely designed product”, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Ikeda et al. teaches that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a three dimensional drawing file (Page 1, Para 0008) and a CAD drawing (Page 4, Para 0122; Page 5, Para 0136).

Han et al. teaches that the plurality of different file types include one or more of a two dimensional drawing file (Page 5, Para 0063) and a Bill of Materials file (Page 2, Para 0020; Page 5, Para 0063), because the online service supports product data including bill of materials and two and three dimensional drawings (Page 5, Para 0063); and that allows using internet to essentially build-to-order by allowing the customers to participate on-line in picking and choosing the components and accessories for customizing a basic product marketed by the company (Page 1, Para 0010).

When a user needs different files at his client terminal, he will use the method of **Ikeda et al.** and **Han et al.** to download different types of files. It is the method that the user will adapt and not exactly the same files as **Han et al.** uses.

Conclusion

ACTION IS FINAL

9. Applicant's amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kandasamy Thangavelu whose telephone number is 571-272-3717. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

K. Thangavelu
Art Unit 2123
August 18, 2005

Paul L. Rodriguez 8/19/05
Paul L. Rodriguez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2125